sight. There is a line of sight, along which, to view each part with anything approaching to correctness, the eye must travel; but, as a whole, which every picture must be, or it is no picture in the artistic sense of the word, no eye can positively view it aright. Whereas, in linear perspective, there is a point opposite the picture, generally in the centre, and which a person at all acquainted with pictures has no difficulty in finding with sufficient exactness, from which a view absolutely correct can be obtained. The picture, as drawn upon the cylinder, will, of course, be correct; but, when flattened out, and hung against the wall, it will be so no longer, as it cannot then be correctly viewed from one point. In fact, the theory is founded upon a false idea of a picture, which it presupposes may be a series of ideas and effects, unfolding as the eye travels on the line of sight; whereas unity of idea and composition is essential to a picture. A picture, in the artistic and proper sense of the word, is one composition, embodying one leading or grand idea to which everything else contributes. There may be some minor ideas and effects, but, like episodes in a poem, they are all to illustrate the main one, which must strike the spectator at once, or the picture is a failure. To contemplate the harmony and beauty of any picture, properly so called, it must be viewed from one point; all its groupings, light and shade, colour, and the rest, were taken, or imagined, from one point by the artist. Any pictorial representation that could not be viewed at one, but at two or more definite points, would in reality be two or more pictures, as the case might be. A panoramic view of a large tract of country would, perhaps, be most advantageously painted on the plan proposed by Mr. Heald; but such views are not in reality pictures; their production does not belong to art. While it is essential to the nature of a picture, essential to the development of the subject, that it have but one point of view, if it cannot be viewed from one point, its groupings and composition, its breadth of light and shade, its harmony of colour, all that costs the artist so much thought to obtain,—and which so beset his path with difficulties, are lost.

Mr. Heald, does not see clearly what are the demands, or the limits of the demands, of pictorial art on the aid of perspective.

Let us consider the nature and origin of the latter, and its connection with art. Perspective is the daughter of geometry, and the handmaid of art, a priestess at her altar. Now, as the legitimate offspring of geometry, her ministrations to art, as far as they are rendered, must of necessity be truthful, and their truthfulness Mr. Heald admits. The only question, therefore, is, are the services of sufficient extent? or, in other words, is perspective equal to the discharge of those functions which art requires of her? Now, she has long held office in the temple of art, and has never failed in her duty, when rightly invoked; yet here are gentlemen who ungallantly propose to discard her in favour of another, some nondescript scion of optics, confessedly less correct in her conduct, but supposed to be more accommodating than her predecessor.

One of the advantages said to be gained by this change is greater scope; that is to say, the privilege to go beyond 60 degrees. Now, perspective is not deficient on this point; it will go as far as the law of our sight allows us to see. But if 60 degrees *were* its greatest truthful scope, no valid objection could be founded on *that*, for anything beyond 60 degrees is as much uncalled for as is an increase in the gravitation of the globe, or any other innovation in the works of nature. No artist has ever had cause to complain of want of "scope." The grandest conceptions of genius have been embodied within that angle. We never heard that Claude Lorraine, Poussin, or any other landscape painter, among the old or modern masters, ever sighed for greater scope, or felt their genius cramped for lack of it. It is the latter-mentioned class of artists that requires the greatest scope. In "history," any difficulty on this score is out of the question. But even landscape artists have abundance of scope within 60 degrees. Judicious ones, I believe, frequently prefer to concentrate their skill on a small portion—within half that angle. When a large extent of country is to be introduced into a landscape, the plan is to increase the distance of the point of sight, and thus decrease the angle under which it is viewed. Further, other difficulties in the management of the picture increase too much along with increase of extent, for any artist to wish for it, who is awake to the arduousness of his profession.

I assert the inviolability of the perspective medium, or plane of the actual picture, because it is not only a true, but the only convenient one; indeed, we can have no other. In my letter in the *Art-Journal*, I remarked that the perspective medium or picture *might* be a segment of a sphere (rather a difficult form for canvas or paper to assume), but the insurmountable objection to this form being practically carried out every artist knows; the picture would inevitably be spoiled to the view by the play of light and shade of the spherical surface itself, and which the plane in common use avoids.

Since the publication of Mr. Heald's theory, a third essay from Mr. Herdman, in support of his views, and written, I believe, two or three months ago, has appeared in the *Art-Journal*. To this, I think, my former paper in THE BUILDER will be considered a full reply. The whole seems to be a confused wandering from the true point at issue; a "darkening of counsel by words without knowledge;" and I can only now add, that, if the writer, after all the pains taken to enlighten him, is still unconvinced of his error, further argument on the subject would be useless.

SAMUEL HUGGINS.

THE BUILDING FOR THE '51 EXHIBITION.

THE committee appointed to advise on "all matters relating to the building," have invited suggestions for the general arrangement of the buildings and premises required.

They do not offer any pecuniary reward for such plans:—they anticipate they may not be limited to the selection of any one plan, but may derive useful ideas from many; and that "the best plan may be determined upon by the help of this general assistance." They propose to make a report, in which they will acknowledge by name those whose plans have been wholly or partially adopted, and perhaps offer some honorary distinction to the successful contributors.

A plan of the ground has been engraved, and may be had on application to the secretaries of the Commission, at the New Palace at Westminster, together with the rules and conditions, which are *to be strictly observed*.

In these it inset forth, that the communications from contributors must consist of a single sheet of paper, not larger than the engraving, with a simple ground plan upon a scale of $\frac{1}{1000}$ of the full size, with such elevations and sections only of the building, and on the same sheet, as may be necessary to elucidate the system proposed—such elevations and sections not being intended to convey more than a general idea of the building, and not entering into details of construction or of architectural decoration; to be accompanied by a short clear written explanation of the system recommended, on a separate sheet.

The plans, &c., must be sent on or before 8th April next, addressed to the Secretaries of the Exhibition, New Palace at Westminster, London.

It is suggested that the most convenient mode of preparing the plan, elevation, and section, would be to draw them upon one of the engraved copies of the plan of the ground which accompany the instructions.

The existing groups of trees must be preserved.

"The roofed portion of the building is to cover a space of 700,000 square feet, or about 65,000 square metres; and the whole building must not occupy, including open spaces, an area of more than 900,000 square feet, or about 84,000 square metres. The building generally will be of one story only.

No space will be required for cattle, or for shrubs or flowers.

It may be assumed, so far as it affects the ground plan, that the light will be obtained entirely from the roof, and the building will be constructed of fire-proof materials."

The general requirements are:—

"1. Simplicity of arrangement.

2. Economy of space.

3. Capability of extending or curtailing the building, without destroying its symmetry as a whole, or interfering with the general arrangement, it being impossible to determine the exact extent of roof required until a late period of construction.

4. Adaptation for the erection of separate portion of the building at different periods.

5. Convenience of ingress and egress, with facilities of access to all parts of the exhibition, either from the exterior or interior.

6. Means of classification of the various objects of different departments.*

7. Wall space for the display of articles requiring it.

8. Means of affording private access and accommodation for exhibitors, with counting-houses, if required, committee-rooms, council-rooms, public refreshment-rooms, and all other public and private accommodation. (This portion of the building may be in two or more stories, if required.)

9. Internal arrangements, by which, under proper regulations, large crowds of visitors may circulate freely, and have convenient access to all parts of the exhibition, and uninterrupted means of examining the various objects exhibited."

* The Commission have determined upon the following classification:—

Section 1.—Raw Materials and Produce.—Illustrative of the natural productions on which human industry is employed.

Section 2.—Machinery for Agricultural, Manufacturing, Engineering, and other purposes, and Mechanical Inventions.—Illustrative of the agents which human ingenuity brings to bear upon the products of nature.

Section 3.—Manufactures.—Illustrative of the results produced by the operation of human industry upon natural produce.

Section 4.—Sculpture, Models, and the Plastic Art generally.—Illustrative of the taste and skill displayed in such applications of human industry.

Of which, Sections 2 and 3 will probably require by far the larger space.

ELECTRO-TELEGRAPHIC PROGRESS.

WE should not make much *progress*, apparently, if the present monopolizers of this important public property were to have it all their own way. As regards the *general* use of the electric telegraph, at charges available to the public at large, they have hitherto been acting the part of the dog in the manger, neither providing for it themselves nor willing to allow others to do so. Complaints, intemperately urged, doubtless, by parties instigated by the company's high charges and official impromptitude to exert themselves in the establishment of a *people's* telegraph, have been smartly snubbed by actions of damages for defamation of personal character, while the new company's bill in Parliament has itself been quite as defamatorily characterized, on the part of the old, as "an attempt to extort money" from the monopolizers, so that the arrestment of its progress might be prayed for; and, in fine, that progress itself has been, by a side wind, further interfered with, and the spirited extension of the telegraph across the channel, in international communication with our French neighbours, by Mr. Brett, revenged or circumvented, by other law actions, in which this "dog in the manger" virtually claims the exclusive *use*—if we can call it so—of electric currents for telegraphic purposes at all! and that, too, although the principal patent on which the company claims, is actually about to expire, being now in the last year of its existence! At same time that it thus shows symptoms of a determination to "die hard," we are glad to observe some slight symptoms of a better spirit, which would have been much more likely to have benefited the company than such proceedings had they appeared in time. It is reported that reductions of the charges on all messages, to 10*s.* for every twenty words, transmitted upwards of 280 miles, have lately been made. Now, whatever *value* the public may set on the animus of such reductions so tardily begun, it is certainly a pity the hint was not taken at once, when the feeling of the public was first decidedly expressed, in the rapid circulation of our little paragraph through the known organs of public opinion, the newspaper press. The pursuit of a bold and rapid course of progress further in the same direction, might even yet perhaps convince the public and the Legislature of the non-necessity of another company. Meantime there is not a moment to lose; for notwithstanding the attempt to damn the new bill in the estimation of the Commons it has been read a second time and ordered for further progress.——The French bill for opening the State electric telegraph of France to the public is under weigh. By Art. 6, private despatches are to be charged,—from 1 to 20 words, 20 centimes per myriamètre (10,000 mètres); from 21 to 40 words, 35 c.; from 41 to 60, 50 c.; from 61 to 80, 65 c.; from 81 to 100, 80 c.—above 100 2 c.